

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 will remain pending in this application. Claims 3 and 8-45 were previously cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Greta Robinson participated in a telephonic interview on February 8, 2007 to discuss the present claim amendments. Examiner Robinson stated that the present claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse and note that independent claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 recite tangible results such as, for example, but not limited to, enabling execution of a query by search provider(s). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action asserts that independent claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 lack antecedent basis for "the executed query." Applicants note, however, that claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 are hereby amended to recite that the single common parse tree is passed to the search provider(s) to enable execution of the query by the search providers, thereby providing antecedent basis for "the executed query."

DOCKET NO.: 144166.1 / MSFT-0561
Application No.: 09/717,588
Office Action Dated: January 18, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential elements. In particular, the Office Action asserts that independent claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 fail to clearly relate "receiving information from a plurality of search providers" and "receiving user input through the user interface" Applicants note, however, that claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 are hereby amended to recite that the user input is received to define a query for execution by the search providers, thereby clearly relating these features.

Additionally, the Office Action asserts that claims independent claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 omit the execution of a query. Applicants note, however, that claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 are hereby amended to recite that the single common parse tree is passed to the search provider(s) to enable execution of the query by the search providers. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: 144166.1 / MSFT-0561
Application No.: 09/717,588
Office Action Dated: January 18, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: March 19, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439